THE PACIFIC

VOL. LXVII. SAN FRANCISCO AND BERKELEY, AUGUST 16, 1917. No. 33.

Pac Theo Sem
Reading Room
2223 Atherton st

O Thou, who in the garden's shade
Didst wake thy weary ones again,
Who slumbered at that fearful hour
Forgetful of thy pain,

Bend o'er us now, as over them,
And set our sleep-bound spirits free,
Nor leave us slumbering in the watch
Our souls should keep with Thee!

—Whittier.

Pacific School of Religion

THE PACIFIC

Established 1851.

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF CONGREGATIONALISM AND THE CHURCH KINGDOM.

$1.50 per year.

Published weekly at 45 Ecker St., San Francisco. Entered at post office in San Francisco as 2nd-class matter.

(The editor and manager is at 2716 Hillegass Avenue, Berkeley, and prefers to have all letters so addressed)

W. W. Ferrier, - - - - - - - Editor

2716 Hillegass Avenue, Berkeley.

A WORD TO THE SOLDIERS ABOUT TO CROSS THE SEA.

We get this message from antiquity—from the Greek philosopher, Epictetus, who lived nineteen hundred years ago. But what he said is an eternal truth; and so, is as applicable as when it was first uttered.

"What art thou? A man! Look at thyself as a solitary creature, and it is according to nature for thee to live to old age, to grow rich, and to keep good health. But if thou look upon thyself as a man and as a part of a certain whole, for the sake of that whole it may become thee now * * * * to sail the seas and run into peril, now to suffer need and perchance to die before thy time. Why, then, dost thou bear it hard? Knowest thou not that, as the foot, alone, is not a foot, so thou, alone, art not a man?"

The whole which Epictetus had in mind was, in the finality, humanity. The late Josiah Royce, a great American philosopher, writing in 1916 on "The Hope of the Great Community," said, "The detached individual is an essentially lost being." He was considering the Community of Mankind as it looms in the future. With reference to the new international life that is to be, Royce wrote:

"There can be no true international life unless the nations remain to possess it. There can never be a spiritual body unless that body, like the ideal Pauline church, has its many members. The citizens of the world of the future will not lose their distinct countries. What will pass away will be that insistent mutual hostility which gives to the nations of today, even in times of peace, so many of the hateful and distracting characters of a detached individual man. In case of human individuals, the sort of individualism which is opposed to the spirit of loyalty, is what I have already called the individualism of the detached individual man—the individualism of the man who belongs to no community which he loves, and to which he can devote himself with all his heart, and his soul, and his mind, and his strength. In so far as liberty and democracy, and independence of soul, mean that sort of individualism, they have never saved men and never can save men. For mere detachment, mere self-will can never be satisfied with itself, can never win its goal. What saves us on any level of human social life is union."

The men who go to France are going in obedience to the call of her country—in loyalty to the nation. Fighting for their country, they will also be fighting for more than that. Above all nations is humanity!

FIGHTING FOR THE ENGLAND THAT IS TO BE.

In his book on "The War and the Soul." the Rev. Dr. Reginald J. Campbell, former pastor of the City Temple, London, writes of a conversation which he had with a delicate lad smashed up for life if he survives—a lad who had little but struggle and drudgery. His chief thought was for his mother, another son of whom was lying in a Belgium grave; and he asks the parson to write and cheer her up to tell her it would be "all reet" with him. Then, writes Campbell, he falls to talking with extraordinary bitterness of the totally unnecessary hardships of the lot of the toiling poor at home in England—"foolish, luxurious, pleasure-loving, ill-directed, scrambling, shambling England," is the way Cambpell puts it. "He is an intelligent youth and knows what he is talking about; he has read a good deal and thought more and takes a fairly active part in local politics, or did before the war."

"Here again I am filled with wonder and respect," says Campbell. "I ask myself what England has ever done for this young fellow that he should leave his mother to suffer and mourn while he goes to fight and die for motherland—or is it something else of which motherland is but the most convenient symbol?"

Campbell continues: "I don't think he knows himself, although he is under no illusions about the course he has chosen. I put the question to him. Well, ye see, he answers slowly, it's a man's job. A man canna slink and hide when thee's a job o' this sort goin'. He could give no further explanation. Here were two commands, two ideals if you like, mutually uncompatable; one very much more than the other, exceedingly dangerous and disagreeable; but he had to obey and he knew without being able to give a very clear reason for his choice. Dimly apprehended. perhaps, was the knowledge that in fighting Engalnd's battles just now he was fighting for a greater than England—for all that is sweet and dear, and wholesome in human lot, for the future of the entire race, for things better and more worthful than good wages and abundant leisure, or even the refinements of life that these can provide, for liberty, comradeship, democratic ideals.

"Was that it? I cannot tell; I think so; but I feel also—nay. I am sure—that behind all this is a motive, an incentive that never can be completely rationalized, a needs must which has more of heaven than of earth in it.

"In all of us there is this strange, mystical susceptibility, call it what you will, this urge to lay all we have and are upon the altar of some ineffable ideal that we feel has the right to demand our uttermost. * * * * Perhaps there is nothing so strong in human nature as this impulse to fling ourselves away at the bidding of we know not what, the something ever blessed that incarnates itself in this cause or objective and now in that. Assuredly there is nothing so exalting within the totality of human experience. Show me the man or the nation without it, and I will show you a nation damned and lost.

"The lower command, the command of expediency and common sense, the command of conventionality and established order, or the dictate of self-love insists, Be tranquil, remain secure, jeopardize nothing, disturb nobody, hold on with care to what you possess, take no risks; the higher command thrusts all prudentialism aside and cries, Give me all; I will have nothing less. It is madness to listen if we want to be safe, but we do listen, and always will."

And does the specific requirement through which the call comes, ever matter in itself? asks Campbell. And his

reply is: "Hardly at all, I should think; what matters is our response."

TREMBLING FOR THEIR COUNTRY.

There are many persons in the United States who have for some time been trembling for their country. A few years ago in a sermon given in the First Congregational Church of Oakland, the Rev. Dr. Charles R. Brown said: "When we set the present organization of society and the current methods of distribution in the searching presence of the commanding ideals held before us in the teaching of Christ, we are sore amazed over our failure to fulfil the divine purpose. We may well tremble when we remember that God is just. Dr. Brown had in mind industrial matters when he said that—the relations between individuals, that of employer and employee. We have in mind in what we say editorially in several different articles this week the relation of nation to nation as well as the relations of individuals.

In the article entitled "A Study of the World War as it Relates to the Coming of the Kingdom of God Upon the Earth," we had to take into consideration, necessarily, conditions in the European countries, the mention of which offends some persons today. Now, that our nation is allied with England, they say "anything that hurts England, hurts the United States." and they cry out, "Traitor." Such persons may be closer to the traitor than are those at whom they hurl that word. No nation is going to get away from God by the people seeking ostrich-like, to hide their heads and sins in the sand. We believe that we are doing our nation a real service when we consider such questions as we have considered this week and in the manner we have. And as to England, the Editor of The Pacific has regard for her next to his own country. All who read our study of the world war through carefully will see at what we aim. We had intended to give a synopsis of it so that the trend would be seen almost at a glance, but have had no time to prepare it.

More persons will soon be trembling for our country if nothing is to be allowed to be said that may tend to show why there are wars, national and individual, and nothing to be said to point the way out of this one. It is not surprising that our Adventist brethren are finding much to strengthen their position these days, and that thousands and thousands of people outside that and other organizations holding kindred ideas are looking for the end of the world.

At a time when members of Congress at Washington are wrangling as they are and unable to come to an understanding as to various questions without almost getting into fist fights; at a time when Premier Lloyd George and Mr. Henderson, recently resigned from the cabinet, are wrangling as they are. there may be good reason for the intimation that the men who precipitated the war in 1914, had before them for some time knotty problems which were so irritating that a war for which no one nation was responsible was inevitable; and that if we refuse to study conditions, no way out will ever be found, and humanity will finally be wiped out. The nations of the world will find their way out of this war differently from that outlined by many persons or war between individuals and between nations will go on in such a manner that mankind will not be deemed worth saving for life on this planet.

The New Christianity, growing into prominence everywhere, is the simple but mighty gospel of Jesus enriched by science and democracy, enforced by the philanthropic impulse, and applied by the educational method.

THE DEMAND IS FOR COMPETITION IN SERVICE.

We ask a careful reading for our article entitled, "A Study of the World War as it Relates to the Coming of the Kingdom of God." A careful reading also of what appears on "A Long Unsolved Problem." We do not believe that there is to be any peace in the world so long as individual life and national life are based on a foundation quite other than that of Jesus of Nazareth who came to give and not to get, and who said: if any man would be first among you, let him be your servant. The call today is for competition in service. That will stop war—war between nations and war between individuals.

It has been well said concerning this war: "The deepest meaning of the great struggle in Europe today is the passing of plutocracy." And further: "A political democracy which produces an economic plutocracy is a sham. The democracy of the nineteenth century did this, and the people are beinning to understand it."

It is only in the interests of humanity accordingly that The Pacific contains this week the reading matter that it does contain.

The Editor, having reviewed the world war this week as it relates to the Kingdom of God that is to come upon the earth, has said all he has any desire to say on the past of the war, and will in the future make only such comments as the progress of the war may require. It will not be deemed necessary to enter any more into the conditions of life in Europe which made the war inevitable. But, no doubt, there will be, right along, much in our own country calling for comment and also current events in Europe.

"BE YE KIND ONE TO ANOTHER."

W. N. Burr.

Not long ago word came from across the waters: "Jane Barlow died last Tuesday." In the company of men and women who are our "familiars" are many whom we have never seen and never shall see in the flesh. They have never known of our existence, but we have known of them and of their work, and they have, in a way, grown into our lives.

Among these everyday but never seen companions of mine has been for many years Jane Barlow, writer of quaint Irish stories and many descriptive articles picturing the land of her love. Her two most famous volumes are "Irish Idylls" and "Strangers in Lisconnel." One of her short stories in "Irish Idylls"—"The Windfall"—is a delightful example of how the thriftlessness of the Irish national character can be idealized into something very near a virtue.

The Widow McGurk one day received a postal order for fifteen shillings from an unknown kinsman in America. Mrs. McGurk had at one time been fairly well-to-do, but she had come down in the world, so that she was somewhat dependent upon the kindness of her neighbors for the necessities of life; and this was a sorry condition of things for a woman of pride and self-respect. So when the fifteen shillings came to her from America she set out at once for the village to lay in a winter's store of provisions. And she was careful to spread the news among her neighbors that they might know that, for a time, at least, she was quite able to provide for herself.

But when she returned from the village she went from one to another of the homes of her neighbors, leaving in

each some gift for the children, the ailing, or the aged; and it was found that she had brought nothing home for herself but "a penny 'orth of salt"; and "she lay down on her ragged bed that night regretting that her last thrup-pence farthin' was not enough to buy the woolen cap she had fancied for a needy neighbor."

Here is an extreme of thriftlessness, and not to be fully commended; and yet—is such thriftlessness as the Widow McGurk's the very worst thing in the world? May we not be finding in that kindly thriftlessness of hers more of the spirit of Him who came not to be ministered unto but to minister than can be found in—in a great deal of man's dealing with his neighbors in this day of ours? Better to be a good bit over-generous in love and service for others than to shrivel one's soul with greed and selfish ambition. "For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul." Ay, what would it profit a nation, any nation, if it should gain a bloody victory over all the rest of the world, but in gaining that victory should lose its soul?

For a time the church of the early centuries clung closely to the commands of her Lord. "In the first two centuries of the Christian Church the moral elevation was extremely high," writes Lecky.

But in the third century the Christianity of that day began to compromise with pagan requirements, and this led in time from peace to militarism. And by and by came so-called Christian nations, whose rulers, at least, sought systematically to build up their power by military force, defending their attitude by the argument that Christ's principles of peace. of mercy. and of truth. are enjoinned upon individuals but not upon nations.

And one day, under the pressure of this double-standard idea, Frederick the Great wrote to his nephew. his successor-to-be on the throne of Prussia, as follows: "Mark this well, my dear nephew, there is nothing which tyrannizes over the mind and heart so much as **religion,** because it agrees neither with our passions nor with the high political views which a monarch should entertain. With regard to war, it is a business in which the slightest scruple spoils the whole matter. In fact, where can an honest man be found willing to carry on a war, if he had not the right to make regulations justifying pillage, incendiarism and carnage?"

The double-standard idea has persisted, more or less, the world over. Men have been saying, "We **must** do this, and we **must** do that in business and in national life that is not becoming in the individual life of the Christian."

Suppose there had been a good bit more of Widow McGurkism at work in the world of affairs, and a good bit less of the spirit of old Frederick the Great—would it not have "paid well" in the end?

"Ideal; not practical; it can't be worked," shall we say? We are seeing just now how it "works" to **refuse** to take up with the laws of life laid down by the Master in his Sermon on the Mount, and by the early Christian Church as it continued His teaching.

COME UP HERE!

Rev. E. D. Weage.

"Come up here! Come up here! Come up here!" It was the birds that called and the streams and the Sugar Pines and Silver Firs and heroic twisted Junipers clinging to the granite on top of the world! "Come up here!" The Chinquapin, and Buckthorn, the scarlet Gilias, and the Sierra Primrose, and the Anemone with its white petals and Paderewski heads away on the edge of the snow. I simply had to go. I wanted to get away from the war. I wanted to quit reading about it and thinking about it and talking about it. God is bigger than the war and I wanted to see God. He speaks more loudly than war and I wanted to hear Him. Oh! I did not quite get away from it. I climbed to the roof of the world with two men, one of whom had a name that sounded like a sneeze and the other of whom was a professor of modern languages and the product of half the nations of Europe. But they could not talk war going up for they had not enough breath and coming down I had something else to do than listen. The sunsets were gorgeous and the sunrises too, if you please. And the only other place that I know of on all the coast where one can get such a combination of precipice and lake and valley and range is on the top of Saw-Tooth. Thunder storms and drenching rain, the great tree trunks outlined by camp-fires at night like cathedral pillars. The picture in greens of mountain meadow bring such rest as comes only from the voice of the Eternal.

To be sure man was doing his worst to spoil it. He was building a stairway to the top of the great dome that overlooks the valley, and making a road for automobiles on a fallen Sequoia and a few such things. But for the most part the era for improvement has not come.

The one message from mountain top and nestling meadow, from tiny flower and giant tree, from clinging haze and heaven-opening sunset was the old, old message, "Rest in the Lord. Wait patiently for Him."

Giant Forest.

A WORD ABOUT THE WAR.

John Wright Buckham.

In company with others I have been asked to give my view of the treatment of the "conscientious objector." As this involves the whole question of the right and wrong of the war I have hesitated to do so, partly because I find myself so far out of accord with many wiser and better men than myself, and partly because the situation is so complicated and difficult to analyze.

Yet, we shall never solve this or any other moral problem without hard and honest thought and the free expression of it, and too great silence is as blameworthy as too hasty speech. I select The Pacific as the medium for that which I have to say, not that I agree with all that it has said on the war, but because it has seemed to me to be, on the whole, independent, earnest and Christian—as well as sincerely patriotic—in its discussion of this issue.

Out of the queries and perplexities which have been seething in my mind—as they have in so many others, since the war forced us to turn from other and more humane interests to this all-absorbing one—the following convictions have emerged:

1. It would be wholly un-American, undemocratic, and un-Christian for our nation to suppress free speech, or to treat the conscientious objector as a traitor, in the interest of "winning the war." To stigmatize the demand for the right of free discussion as "pro-German" is a deep injustice.

2. It would be equally unfair and un-American for any citizen to abuse this right and impugn the motives and intentions of those who are responsible for our entering the war. While these motives are undoubtedly mixed there is every reason to believe that the main motive was high and unselfish, and that those who are conducting the war are doing it in the spirit of loyal devotion.

3. It does not follow from this that the only kind of patriotism is military and that the only way one can love his country and serve it, is by helping to win the war. Fidelity to conscience is the corner-stone on which this nation was built and to undermine it now would be to endanger our noble heritage. It is the foundation of patriotism.

4. The truest patriotism is that which seeks to have one's country do most for humanity. My country for humanity is the true patriot's motto. Internationalism is not the substitute for patriotism, but is its fulfillment.

5. War is radically opposed to the patriotism of internationalism. It is an essentially irrational, inhuman institution, and must and will follow tyranny and feudalism and slavery and lynching to the scrap heap. It settles nothing except which nation is most accomplished in the inhuman art of destruction. It is a denial, not only of love but of reason. War is essential unfaith in God and in man. Militarism is, after all, at heart, moral timidity. It dares not trust humanity. It has no confidence in the mightiest forces there are—reason and good-will. War is contrary to both the spirit and teaching and method of Jesus. The Cross means nothing unless it be reliance upon spiritual forces as against physical.

6. This does not mean that force is never to be employed—for purposes of restraint and discipline. War and the use of force are not identical. Physical compulsion is a useful aid to moral suasion in dealing with undeveloped intelligences. A parent may wisely use it with a child, but when he has become the equal of the parent in strength and intelligence, the use of force becomes a struggle for mastery—and that leads to war—which is the effort to hurt the other party. Nor is self-defense the equivalent of war. War is always retaliatory. It seeks to injure its opponent—the more the better.

7. The Christ spirit is not that of **non-resistance** but of moral-resistance. It means the rejection of physical weapons for those that are moral and spiritual. Christianity is always militant, never militaristic. It aims to overcome the world by faith—faith in the justice of God and the humanity of man.

8. Yet the application of these principles to our participation in the present war is not so simple as it looks. There is room for radical difference of judgment among those who hold the same principles. That is where the rub comes, and the tragedy may come, too, if we are not careful.

9. For it is possible to fight for righteousness—yes, to do wrong for the sake of right. And when that is done, the motive purifies the doer—but not the deed. It does not make the wrong right. If it did, many of the worst crimes of history would be justified. Those who are pressing this war from noble motives may be better men, as well as braver, than those who are opposing it—I believe for the most part they are—but they may be perpetuating a great evil, nevertheless.

10. How then, Great God, how!—shall we straighten out this terrible tangle? How can we honor and sustain our brave soldiers and sailors, and yet be true to our consciences and our Christ, and condemn this Hell into which so many of our noblest young men are going at their country's call.

11. This at least is certain: If they make their bed in this modern hell, "Thou art there." And not one drop of its pitch shall smirch them or one point of it touch them —except the physical—if they are true. And if they are not, the responsibility is more ours who send them than theirs who go.

12. The main issue now is, What are we fighting for? And what kind of a peace will satisfy our purpose? On that issue every American has a right to a judgment and a right to utter it. **Democracy and a righteous and lasting peace**—this is our acknowledged goal.

13. How can it be secured? Must it be only by the utter defeat of the German government, or the military party? That seems right, and it might be, if we could get at this enemy of humanity, this ruthless blood-stained group of men, guilty of crimes against humanity that have roused the indignation of all righteous men and women. But the tragedy is that they can be reached only over the dead bodies of hundreds of thousands of innocent young men and boys whom they have thrust between themselves and their foes—the army. And back of the army are the homes. We must see them robbed and see little children starve if the goal is to be Germany crushed—and the nation that has supported them deserves castigation—but who are pure enough and righteous enough and free enough from rational wrong-doing to do it? And if for every one of the guilty, thousands of the innocent must be sacrificed, if complete victory can be purchased, only at the cost of agonized mothers and starving children and a blasted civilization—if vengeance is God's and not man's; if the true hope of humanity lies not in executing judgment, nor even in paralyzing evil, but in the purging of the national conscience and the power of self-recovery—is it right to press this war to a "finish"?

15. The great ideal of America—one that she has cherished with hope and longing—is an international tribunal accompanied by disarmament, as complete as possible. When Germany and Austria are ready for this, together with the renunciation of annexations and indemnities, and their word to that effect has come with authority, ought the war to be pressed further? It is easy and natural to say, "These declarations are insincere; we cannot trust a nation that has been guilty of such cruelty and perfidy; they are made in a spirit of pride and not of peace. Let us reject them till we are sure they mean what they say."

16. Ought the Allies to take this attitude? Ought our nation to support it? What is the probable issue of such a course? It is this: Increasing bitterness, resentment on the part of Germany, and determination to fight to the bitter end. That spirit may be wrong, disastrous, suicidal. It may hold back peace till the bleeding world is too exhausted to ever think. It will injure all the nations still more terribly and may forever cripple Germany. No true lover of humanity can want that. It is wrong to plunge blindly in without facing the outcome.

17. It would be unwarranted to charge our Government with abetting Allied ambitions, if such there are, or of cherishing animosity, or of seeking any ends but the highest. The writer has no such intention, but only to urge such of his fellow-citizens as may read this to ask themselves again, What are our aims and principles in prolonging the war? We owe it to ourselves, our sons, our country, our God, to answer that question with serious thought. For it is only by clear and calm and charitable thought and discussion that we can meet this crisis intelligently as true Americans and true Christians. Such problems are the concern, not of the Government only, but of the whole people.

18. How does all this bear upon the case of the conscientious objector? It goes to show that he should be treated with fairness and consideration, provided he has an honest and permanent, and not a temporary conviction that war is wrong.

19. It does not follow that he has no especial duty to his country in time of war. If drafted, he should be

given an opportunity to serve in some other capacity, in agriculture or engineering or ambulance, or other work. It is captious for him to say that this is indirectly supporting the war. He is bound to grant those who believe in war the same rights of conscience that he asks for himself, and to aid them if they are wounded, and to help feed the nation, even if in his judgment it is engaging in a wrong cause.

20. The sum of it all is that there is now a searching summons to everyone of us to be patriotic and human and conscientious and Christian. This is the universal draft—with no exemptions except at the cost of honor.

A STUDY OF THE GREAT WORLD WAR AS IT RELATES TO THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD UPON THE EARTH.

Several years ago that Prince of British preachers, Dr. Alexander Maclaren, wrote a graphic exposition on these words in the 24th chapter of Matthew, "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together." In that exposition Dr. Maclaren remarked that we cannot tell when evil has become incurable or when in the language of the text, the mass of any community has become a carcass; but that God can tell. There may be flickerings of life that men can discern, or there may be death—all unsuspected by our shallow mortal vision. But God sees whatever there is, and when restoration or recovery is found not possible, then the scavengers come and the carcass is cleared from the face of the earth. Dr. Maclaren declares that this is the law that has been working from the very beginning, working as well in regard to the long delays as in regard to the swift execution. He considers another metaphor in the Old Testament, which presents the same idea in a very striking manner. God is represented in this as "awakening," as if his judgment had slumbered. "All round that dial the hand goes creeping, creeping, creeping clowly, but when it comes to the appointed line, then the bell strikes. And so years and centuries go by; all chance of recovery departs, and then the crash! The ice palace built upon the frozen blocks stands for a while, but when the spring thaws come it breaks up."

Illustrations of the Working of an Eternal Law.

Dr. Maclaren gives some instances and illustrations from history. He cites the case of the Cannanitish peoples whose hideous immoralities had turned the land into a regular sty of abominations. They had been wallowing and wallowing in their filth. God's spirit had been striving with them a long time, but finally "the measure of their iniquity was full," and the fierce hosts of the desert swept them from the face of the earth in a whirlwind of fire and sword.

Taking another illustration, he says: "These very people who had been the executioners of divine judgment, settled in the land, fell into the snare—and you know the story. The captives of Israel and Judah were other illustrations of the same thing. The fall of Jerusalem, to which our Lord pointed in the solemn context of these words, was another. For millenniums God had been pleading with them, sending his prophets, rising early and sending—saying, 'Oh, do not do this abominable thing which I hate!' 'And last of all he sent his Son.' Christ being rejected, God had shot his last bolt. He had no more that he could do. Christ being refused, the nation's doom was fixed and sealed, and down came the eagles of Rome, again God's scavengers, to sweep away the nation on which had been lavished such wealth of divine love, but which had now come to be a rotting abomination, and to this day remains in a living death, a miraculously preserved monument of God's judgments."

In another illustration Dr. Maclaren shows again how the executants of the law fell under its power. "That nation which crushed the feeble resources of Judaea as a giant might crush a mosquito in his grasp, in its turn became honeycombed with abominations and immoralities; and then, down from the frozen north came the fierce Gothic tribes over the Roman territory. One of their captains called himself the 'Scourge of God,' and he was right. Another, swooping down of the vultures, flashed from the blue heavens and the carrion was torn to fragments by their strong beaks."

But still farther down the centuries does Dr. Maclaren lead us—to the French Revolution of the eighteenth century. How vividly the events in detail will come up in the mind of every student of history who reads here his words! "The fathers sowed the wind, and the children reaped the whirlwind. Generations of heartless luxury, selffishness, carelessness of the cry of the poor, immoral separation of class from class, and all the sins which a ruling caste could commit against a subject people, had prepared for the convulsion. Then, in a carnival of blood and deluges of fire and sulphur, the rotten thing was swept off the face of the earth, and the world breathed more freely for its destruction."

In these and other graphic ways Dr. Maclaren, one of England's greatest preachers, not only in his own age but in any age, showed how from the beginning of time, all over the world, this law had been working—"with delays according to the possibilities of restoration and recovery which the divine eye discerns," but working everywhere through all the past centuries.

Then, he asked his hearers,—for this was given as a sermon before it was published in his Expositions—he asked: "Has the law exhausted its force? Are there no more application of it? Are there no European societies at this day that in their godlessness and social iniquities are hurrying fast to the condition of carrion?" He asked his hearers then to look around, to reflect, as he continued: "Drunkenness, sensual immorality, commercial dishonesty, senseless luxury among the rich, heartless indifference to the wail of the poor, godlessness over all classes and ranks of the community!" And this scholarly man, one of England's most eminent sons, declares this as his deliberate conviction: "Surely, surely, if the body politic be not dead, it is sick night unto death. And I, for my part, have little hesitation in saying that, as far as one can see, European society is driving as fast as it can, with its godlessness and immorality, to such another 'day of the Lord' as these words of my text suggest." He spoke in way of warning, and his admonition was: "Let us see to it that we do our little part to be the 'salt of the earth,' which shall keep it from rotting, and so drive away the vultures of judgment."

European Society a Few Years Before the War.

Dr. Maclaren spoke of European society, and of course had in mind France and Germany and other countries as well as his own.

We have space to consider at this time only two of the nations of Europe—Germany and England; and these, only briefly. Our conclusion, after reading many writers, is that Germany was not any more materialistic and militaristic than England was.

No British writer, perhaps, has studied the German and Germany more exhaustively than has Jaseph McCabe, the author of "The Soul of Europe." McCabe starts with the assumption that the British side is the righteous side, and with that assumption proceeds to try to prove that

the entente allies must, for the future safety of Europe, bring about one or the other of two results: "We have either to insist on an abandonment of militarism and the payment of a full indemnity, which will involve the military occupation and profound embitterment of Germany for years; or else we have to detach such provinces from Austria and Germany as to reduce their actual strength materially below that of the Allies. Since Germany will probably prove as cunning in organizing passive resistance as she has proved in organizing war, the first expedient is not attractive."

In carrying out the second expedient, he argues that the Allies will leave Germany "no legitimate ground for complaint." "We shall be dealing with them by the measure that they would have used in dealing with us."

A strange way, this would be, for Christian nations to justify any action! However McCabe goes on then to try to show why this measure may be justly used—and fails, of course.

MrCabe's chapter on "The Soul of Germany" is filled with inconsistencies and illogical conclusions, which only the most careful study reveals. We may point these out at some future time. But there are certain conclusions and statements which can be accepted, because they are supported by a mass of evidence from a variety of soruces. Here is a statement that can be accepted:

Materialism in Germany.

"There are two antagonistic schools in modern German discussion of the national character. One set of writers maintain that the German soul is rising to its most glorious manifestation; that the approaching triumph of its idealism lights up for men the whole avenue of the future. This is incomparably the larger and more popular school.

"But another set of German writers, less in number, but of equal or greater authority, deplore that in recent decades the great soul of Germany has sunk deep in spiritual sloth, in vice and selfish indulgence, in all that is suggested by that horrid sounding word, 'materialism.' Professor Paulsen and Professor Simmel of Berlin, Professor Thode of Heidelberg, and other distinguished scholars, use this language."

Here is another statement by McCabe, the truth of which is well attested: "Let me emphasize that cruelty and deception are **not** parts of the German character. The native German character has no more of these defects than any other national character, and has less than some. Let me repeat, too, that the idea of a simple nation, having been dragged without its consent into this war, or been duped into consenting to the war, is wholly wrong; and that the German people, as a body, has endorsed what seem to us the foul deeds of their leaders and soldiers."

In presenting facts about Germany, Mr. McCabe is excellent. He knows Germany as few other men do. But when he begins to reason about those facts in the light of this war and in their relation thereto, he gets into a labyrinth out of which he never finds his way.

From the standpoint of the psychologist he tries to explain what he calls psychological problems. He tells how certain ideas got into the minds of the people, for instance, "the sober thought that their beloved and prosperous land was surrounded by jealous and criminally-minded enemies." He tells us that from the university chair to the rural journal the cry was: "Their wonderful prosperity was threatened by a combination of the barbaric Slav, the decadent Frenchman, and the perfidious Englishman. * * * They were at least being cheated of their share of the globe, their place in the sun: so, many of the most eminent scholars of the country assure them; and the assurance was carried by the Leagues to every village of Germany. On this assurance they shouldered the burden of the great army and the great fleet." The fault in Mr. McCabe's writing is that he fails utterly to take into consideration the facts which led to all this assurance. He says: "One need not suppose that any very large section of the German people was deluded by Treitschke's or Bernhardi's ludicrous praise of war as a highly moral agency instituted by Providence."

Nevertheless he writes: "This generation has been soaked in pernicious literature, partly provided by fanatics, partly by interested merchants, manufacturers, and soldiers."

He gives no consideration to the question as to the way these ideas got into the minds of the persons who began to circulate them. Was there any foundation for them outside of Germany? Was there any foundation for them inside of Germany? Where did the ideas root? Was it in both Germany and the other nations? And was it ultimately in a false conception of both individual and national life?

These questions were not considered by him. They are not considered to much extent in any country of the world today. If the world goes on this way there will be many carcasses for the vultures to sweep from the face of the earth.

How Possessions Must Be Used.

"That no man liveth unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself," is an eternal truth. No nation either! All possessions of whatever nature, are a trust, to be used for the good of the whole—for the good of the individual, the community, the nation, the world. This, as to individual possessions; and as to national possessions—they are a trust to be used not simply for the good of the nation, but for the good of all nations. Only thus can anything be used by the individual so as not to harm him. Only thus can anything be used by any nation so as not to harm the nation.

There are in the world today individual and national ownerships, guaranteed by law, which give the right to hold as against the rest of the community, of individuals, or of nations, that which the holders are not using for the common advantage. Such ownership is not only damaging to others, but it reacts upon the possessor. "For just as food nourishes the body in passing through it, just as flame shines brightly by reason of the current of materials passing through it, so it is with possessions: if a man's gains are gains also for the whole, his membership remains healthy and beautiful; if they are held selfishly as against the whole, they beget disease and impurity in him; he becomes a point of irritation, weakness, and corruption in the social body. His own life-level is lowered, and with it the life-level of the whole."

As it is with individuals so it is with nations.

We believe that Jesus taught human solidarity, and that every disregard of this eternal truth brings impairment; and that continual disregard will mean destruction.

Mankind makes up one great whole. Individually we are like mountain peaks, standing out distinct, but at the base, one and the same mountain—all one, at the foundation; and so, all one throughout. This idea of solidarity has been expressed thus:

"It is as if there were a number of vessels, of different sizes, shapes, capacities, kinds—containing water and connected with each other because their respective orifices open into a common base or reservoir. The water will tend to find a common level in all the vessels, though one may be as narrow as a test-tube and another as capacious as a bell-jar. If for any imaginable reason, one of the vessels suffers an impoverishment, the level of the water

in the other vessels becomes lower in consequnce; if, on the other hand, any vessel receives the gift of an augmented supply, this is communicated on to the rest, who advantage by it, but at the cost of the vessel that is filled." But this loss is in the finality no loss, but a gain. Giving is living—and, living is giving.

Germany Considered Industrially and Socially.

With such ideas as these in mind, we pass to a further consideration of Germany, and from that to a similar consideration of England.

Early in the present century Germany had become a great nation commercially and industrially. We find a brief graphic description in an article by Dr. Hillis on "Germany's Growth and Her Problems of Expansion," and summon this friend of England to our aid. Writing in 1915 Hillis said:

"Her foreign trade is nearly twice as large as ours; and yet our Republic has thirty millions more people and twelve times the territory." In showing the thrift of the German people, he stated that in the period between 1900 and 1907 the deposits by the German working people in savings banks grew exactly nine times as fast as the deposits by the working people of Britain in British banks. The German saving-banks' deposits by the working people advanced during those seven years from two billion dollars to three and a half; and this is the more remarkable because the German working people in addition had been pouring their savings into land, town and city lots, houses and cottages, while the English workingman found it almost impossible to obtain freehold land. We are told further that the prosperity of Germany is further indicated by the lessening number of paupers; and that the most terrible memory an American brought home from England at any time for many years has been the recollection of "the hunger brigade" on the Victoria Embankment. "Poverty in England is like the water in a swamp. When the hunter puts down his foot, the mire oozes up all about with every step, and when you go from the Whitechapel district in London to the poorer regions of Liverpool or Manchester, that problem of poverty, rags, squalor, and wretchedness is always present. But you may travel for weeks and months in Germany without even seeing a beggar or having a hand stretched out for assistance. You look in vain for any tenement region. * * *

"And while Germany's workmen are probably the best educated working people in the world," says Hillis. "She has the biggest machines, the healthiest human tools, and is the best organized."

England Considered Industrially and Socially.

Let us turn to England now, and consider what she was at the time Dr. Maclaren sounded his eloquent warning, like the prophets of ancient days. We shall let Dean Charles R. Brown of the Yale School of Religion speak now out of his book "The Social message of the Modern Pulpit"—sermons and lectures given by him in the First Congregational Church of Oakland and on the Lyman Beecher foundation at Yale in 1906: "We are informed by those who have utilized the statistics carefully gathered by men and women who are working in the East End of London in connection with the University and Social Settlements, that there are at least eight hundred thousand people there who are habitually underfed. These unfortunates never know from year's end to year's end the joy and strength of three full meals in one day. Because of this they are losing health and ambition; they are losing intelligence and effectiveness; they are dropping down into the abyss. And meanwhile there are, also, more than a hundred thousand able-bodied men in England who put themselves down in the census as of 'No occupation.' They work at nothing ; they are living, many of them, on hereditary estates, dwelling in noble city palaces and in lovely country seats surrounded by acres and acres of park and game preserve, taking their lordly pleasure, while thousands of their fellow-Englishmen are starving—starving when they might be living by the cultivation of that very land held as game preserve for the amusement of many useless idlers."

Picture to yourselves the cold-blooded insolent inhumanity of it!" said Dr. Brown. "Sumptuous idleness standing over against the actual starvation of ill-requited toil!" Dr. Brown tells us further that he had talked with a man who stood on the streets of Manchester one day, peeling an orange, and when he flung away the peel it was instantly seized upon by hungry, gaunt children and ravenously devoured. This we are told is nothing unusual. Day by day thousands of persons for years have been going along the streets of London picking up plum stones and peach stones, cracking them and eating the pit. "They go also to the garbage barrels and sort out that which is not too nauseating for them to be able to swallow," wrote Dr. Brown, "in order to satisfy the gnawing hunger within."

Several years ago, we know not exactly when, fifteen or twenty or a few more, Edward Carpenter, a Briton and a Seer, wrote concerning England clutching at what he called the "gaud of empire." And then he went on:

"O England, fooled and blind,
Come look but a moment on yourself!
See, through your streets—what should be living sap of your free blood—
These brutish, squalid, joyless, drink-sodden populations flowing
And in your mills and factories the many weary faces, sad monotonous lives,
Or miles on miles of cottage tenements with weakly, red-eyed children, wornout mothers.
See, from your offices and shops at closing hours, the morbid stream, as from the unhealthy glands within the body."

Going on, Carpenter drew a picture which fits exactly with the brief words of Maclaren and with those of Dean Brown; he described life as it was then, saying:

And this Thing cries for Empire.
This Thing from all her smoky cities and slums, her idiot clubs and drawing rooms, and her brokers' dens,
Cries out to give her blessings to the world!
And even while she cries
Stand Ireland and India at her doors
In rags and famine."

Get Carpenter's "Towards Democracy" and read it and try to imbibe the spirit of it! The democracy of which Carpenter writes is the democracy which is in Jesus: it is Christ. "Towards Democracy" is Towards Christ!

All nations need the salvation therein to be found—the United States, England, Germany, France, Russia, all!

Readers of The Pacific have now in brief a fair picture of social conditions as they were in England and Germany in the opening decades of the twentieth century. They have them not by any juggling of ours with facts, but mainly in the words of thoroughly reliable and able men.

Considered industrially which country stood nearest to the platform of the Man of Nazareth? Of course there were many abominable features of life in Germany—much that could not go on and life be what it is intended to be,

but there was less disease in the body politic in Germany than there was in England. The German people had organized more carefully, had saved more, and by their spirit of solidarity and methods of mutual co-operative helpfulness had made the conditions of the average man far better than his condition in England or any other country on the face of the earth. Industrially considered, Germany was not so close to the day for the vultures as England was.

We are not forgetful of Russia and France; and would, if space allowed, picture conditions in those countries. Suffice it to remark that in those countries also there was much to be challenged and overthrown if there was to be life for the body politic. Materialism was wide-sperad in those countries also. In Russia a rule which blighted life everywhere—now gone under in this "day of the Lord."

But the two outstanding nations were Britain and Germany—and these were destined to be the great opposing powers in a conflict that was inevitable unless individuals nad nations should be suddenly shifted in some unusual manner from the courses they had been pursuing.

Let us see now how things were geographically and territorially.

Germany, one of the five great nations of the world, in the front rank industrially and commercially, was limited practically to a territory less in size than our Texas. Including the small footholds she had secured outside that narrow limit, Germany extended over one million square miles of territory. England, over eleven and a half million miles. Russia, eight and a half million. France, four and one-half million.

Remarks Indicating Slumbering Fires.

A remark made by one business man in England to another business man just a few weeks before the war, given in Edward Carpenter's book, "The Healing of the Nations," made at a time however when there was no thought of war being imminent, shows toward what the two great nations had been moving for some time. It was: "England ought to unite with other nations and wipe Germany off the earth." When asked, Why? the reply was: "Look at her exports; they have been climbing up until they are almost equal to ours." This should not be taken as an intimation that there was any general expression of that kind. The remark was only a flaming up of what was under the surface, and was manifest not infrequently in various ways. These manifestations of dangerous conditions of life were in Germany as well as in England. Carpenter gives in connection with the foregoing remark another made by an Englishman to a German about a dozen years before, and along with it the German's reply.

The Englishman, who was traveling in Germany, said: "I find your people so obliging and friendly that I think surely whatever little differences there are between us as nations will be dispelled by closer intercourse and so all danger of war will pass away.

"No," replied the German, "you are quite mistaken. You and I are friendly, but that is only as individuals. As nations we shall never rest till we have war. The English nation may well be contented because they have already got all the good things of the earth—their trade, their ports, their colonies; but Germany will not allow this to go on forever. She will fight for her rightful position in the world; she will challenge England's mercantile supremacy."

In 1888 John W. Burgess, who was for several years professor of constitutional and international law in Columbia University, was being entertained on one of the great ducal estates in England. He saw there a great establishment—life on a regal basis, great acres covered with parks and game preserve, etc., etc., but nothing visible with which to sustain all this. Inquiry brought out the fact that the wherewithal came from the duke's great factory in London and that this rested on trade in the vast British domain reaching all around the world. Professor Burgess expressed some of the thoughts that arose in his mind, and asked his host whether he had the right conception of the system. It was as he conceived it substantially as follows: Situated as it was the United Kingdom—widely spoken of as England—could have but a limited existence if left to itself. There must be alway a vast colonial dominion, ever increasing in its commercial needs, in which to dispose of the manufactured products of the Islands, and from which to draw in exchange the agricultural products to feed them; a vast merchant marine sufficient in its strength to control the trade and commerce between the Islands and the Colonial Empire in the different parts of the world, and a vast navy able to sustain and protect this control at will by physical force.

Prof. Burgess communicated his idea to his host and asked him whether it was a fair presentation of the British economic system . He replied that it was, with the modification that in practice Great Britain permitted free trade between her colonies and other countries. Burgess said to him that Great Britain could do that at that time because as a matter of fact she had then no real competitor in manufacture and commerce, but he asked, "Suppose some successful competitor should aries?" The duke replied: "We should have to shut them out by law or destroy them by force." But would your colonies acquiesce in a protective tariff imposed by the British Parliament against the rest of the world for the profit of the British manufacturer?" was the next question. And the answer was: "Possibly not, and in that case we would have to destroy our competitor by physical force." We do not quote this as any intimation that England would have ever attempted any such thing as this, but merely to show the awful temptation that nations are under to maintain their exisence in the way individual and national life has long been based.

Early in the twentieth century, Mr. Chamberlain led in an effort to ward off what was seen to be the danger of allowing other countries to trade freely with the British colonies by a high protective tariff. But the people in general did not believe at that time that any country could compete successfully with the British manufacturer; and for this reason and because they feared the result on the colonies of an attempt to force them to purchase British goods, the effort failed.

How England and Germany Faced Each Other a Few Years Before the War.

It ws thus that England and Germany faced each other as trade competitors during the few years immediately preceding the war. The former wished to maintain the status quo, the latter desired to have it changed voluntarily or overthrown—wanted more of "a place in the sun." Each believed thoroughly and conscientiously that its continued existence depended on securing what it desired. Germany tried to get footholds here and there, but was thwarted by Britain, who held that her existence would be endangered thereby. For instance, that a terminal point on the Persian Gulf for the Berlin-Bagdad railway in control of Germany would endanger British supremacy in India, etc., etc. At times it seemed as if negotiations were to succeed which would give Germany opportunity such as she desired. Many British people favored this, and worked for it. But the fatal day came on apace, with nothing of this kind accomplished. The tragedy at Sara-Jevo on June 28, 1914, was the spark that lighted the fires of a war sooner or later inevitable. We do not believe

that the facts are at this time to be had with which to place the responsibility for the outbreak in August, 1914. Only the careful, unprejudiced historian of some future year can do that.

The facts are that Great Britain discerned that without regard to the question as to who was responsible for the war, whether Germany had planned it or not, her supremacy was endangered. The challenge which it had long been seen Germany would make if the **status quo** were not altered, had been made, whether intentionally or not, and it must be met.

We believe it has been established that Britain would have entered the conflict regardless of the violation of the neutrality of Belgium. Former United States Senator Beveridge, a few months after the war began, conversed with several thoroughly informed and eminently thoughtful men, belonging to the various political parties in England, and found only one who ventured to intimate that Great Britain would not have declared war if Germany had not violated Belgium's neutrality, and this man qualified his statement by saying "but for this, England might not have entered the war." Beveridge writes: "A composite of the views of these men, liberal and conservative, was that Great Britain could not afford to see France crushed; or to permit Germany to get a foothold on the Channel; or to allow her to become strong enough to contest or even question Great Britain's mastery of the seas; or, that Great Britain is committed to the doctrine of 'the balance of power,' which British statesmen first formulated and which Germany's growing strength was threatening."

Application of a Philosophy of Life.

According to our philosophy of life, which is founded on the teachings of Jesus, on the eternal truth of human solidarity, and of oneness also with God, that in England which Germany challenged is some day to be surrendered. No nation is, however, justified in the making of such a challenge in her own selfish interests—nor by war. That Germany challenged by war has not yet been proved. The tangled threads of the many events during the few days, even weeks and months, preceding the day of out-break are yet to be unraveled. Germany struck first. All know that. There is much more that many persons think they know, but which, indeed, they do not know.

Some years before the war, Mr. Harbutt Dawson, a Briton, wrote a carefully studied out history of Germany in which he said: "There is no more pacific people in Europe." Joseph McCabe quotes this and remarks: "Yet there is no doubt that at the very time when this shrewd observer pronounced this opinion, the German people were preparing to bring a terrible war on Europe." We are not saying that this may not be true. We do refuse, however, to accept it as a fact at a time when English writers in the hysteria of war are denying so much of actual truth put forth by them concerning Germany before the war, and when Germany also is filled with hysteria concerning England and other countries. We prefer the utterances of days of sanity.

Senator Beveridge quotes a prominent German Socialist, a man who in the past has bitterly opposed the Emperor and who now agrees with him only in carrying the war on to a desirable conclusion—quotes him as saying: "There is no question that the Emperor did not want this war. I am fair enough to concede that undoubtedly the Emperor's one great ambition was to close his reign without war. I believe that he wished to be known as the peace emperor." Beveridge states that very few persons, if any, can be found in Germany who believe otherwise; and it is an oft-repeated statement that Emperor William had had three opportunities to wage successful war against each of the three great nations of Europe. And there is no evidence that others in Germany crowded the Emperor into the war.

But how as to our declaration that no nation can be justified in challenging another for the surrender of something in her own selfish interests? Here, we believe, Germany falls short—grievously so. And if without some chastisement in this conflict Germany were to accomplish her aims, she would not use for the good of humanity what she secured, and would herself fall under later penalties, just as certain ancient nations did, as set forth in Dr. Maclaren's exposition. Today a nation becomes the executant of the eternal law; tomorrow it falls under the law; it need not be—may not be—to utter extinction, but to the extent of great tribulation and suffering and loss.

But it must not be lost sight of that this has long been the way of the world, individually and nationally. The unity of mankind has not been recognized, and both individually and nationally life has been too largely on the principle of "everyone for himself and the devil take the hindmost." If it can be shown that this war will to a great extent overthrow that principle, it will be shown to relate itself marvelously to the coming kingdom of God.

The United States a Participant.

Today the United States is a participant in the war which for two and a half years we viewed as spectators. Wev'e got to fight, at least for a time, and do our very best. It is too late to wrangle over the question as to how and why we got in. Our cause may be a righteous one and it may not; there is room for a difference of opinion. But there is no good reason for the discussion of this now.

Nor is there any call for anyone to try to stir to hatred by recitation of atrocities in Armenia. All know that there are some fiendish men and women in East St. Louis and elsewhere in our country and in other parts of the world outside Turkey; and that though on a smaller scale the atrocities in Belgium have had their parallel within the past quarter of a century in war in which Germany had no part. Students of war and criminal anthropology understand these matters, and the psychologist casts light on much that is otherwise inexplicable save on the theory of demoniacal possession. What concerns us just now about our own country is that so few persons apparently have any conception of the relation the war bears to the coming of the kingdom of God upon the earth. If history has any lesson for us we ought to be taking heed to our ways. Suppose the people of this country let Germany's sins rest for a time between Germany and God, trusting to God to handle that matter big as it is. Even the Lusitannia question and its many tangled threads can wait for settlement a while. It may be that God is settling even now with Germany for that and much more. Settling also with England for the awful sin of imposing the opium trade on China, and, for keeping it there a long time for revenue. There are at least some motes in our own eyes that need attention. No country in the world has made such a mad race after the Almighty Dollar as ours has. And for some time Labor in this country has been challenging Capital, the great holding body, just as Germany had been challenging England, the great holding body among the nations. England as we have shown, wanted to maintain the status quo, in her own interests. Germany wanted to overthrow it in her own interests. Capital wants to hold on to what it has, in its own interests for the most part. Labor wants to get constantly more and more of it, in its own interests largely. The people of this country would better begin to try to ascertain whether there is good rea-

son for this challenge on the part of Labor, that may in a few years plunge us into anarchy. We need also to give some attention to our awful race prejudice, which in its out-workings constitutes one of the biggest sins known anywhere in the world.

It is high time that the people of this country were seriously considering whether we had not for some time been driving fast toward such a day of the Lord as the words in the Gospels suggest, "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together."

The Earthly Life the Kingdom of God Presupposes.

A Kingdom of God on earth presupposes, as already stated, an individual and national life on the basis of the principles of Jesus—on giving and not on getting, on altruism and not on selfishness. But there was nothing in all our progress to indicate that the awful abominations which God hates would have been much changed or reduced without just such a cataclysm as this into which we have now come. Mankind, we do not believe, is destined to be blotted out soon on this planet, but destined rather to such a unity and harmony as Jesus had in mind when he told his disciples to pray, Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

So believing, and seeing the hand of God ruling and over-ruling, bringing good even through war on the lower stages of human evolution, the present writer could follow the flag of his country to France and there do his part to bring about a better day for the world. He would not pray the Lord as he was about to enter on a battle to help him to kill Germans, nor to give victory to his side, but simply to help him to do his duty where his lot had been cast, and to so guide in the great conflict that the day would be hastened when his will would be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Decades ago, Tennyson, with the vision of the seer, wrote:

"For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonders that would be;

"Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;

"Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nation's' airy navies grappling in the central blue;

"Far along the world-wide whisper of the south wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples flying thro' the storm,

"Till the war-drum throbbed no longer and the battle flags were furled
In the Parliament of man, the federation of the world."

A year or more ago Reginald J. Campbell, former pastor of the City Temple, London, wrote:

"There is one great thing to hope for as an outcome of the present upheaval—a republican Germany, or Germany and Austria a United States of Middle Europe. In time we should all become members of such a federation; and even if not, we could almost afford to beat our swords into plough-shares and our spears into pruning hooks. Give us democratic control in the monarchically ruled nations of the world, and there will be no more wars.

"This would be worth fighting for, and probably it is what Europe is fighting for without knowing it."

It is of course toward such conditions that mankind is moving, and it is not at all unlikely that the other nations of the world will be able to say to Germany a quarter of a century hence in Bible words: "Ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good." And whatever the outcome even the German people will discern some day that the war moved them up higher on the pathway of progress.

It has been said: "If humanity—the whole race of man—could be threatened by the inhabitants of some other planet about to invade the Earth, humanity would group itself into a single organized crowd fast enough; * * * but as no such object of common hostility is as yet apparent, humanity is not affected by any common emotion powerful enough to weld it into a crowd able to absorb nations and subordinate their several patriotisms."

If a large number of persons could be made to realize that an individual and national life based on self-interest is bound sooner or later to destroy humanity, there would be promise of the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God. This war will help to create that number, and to the extent that the people of our country keep hatred out of their hearts will they escape those divine thunderbolts which are sure to fall until Christ is all and in all.

A LONG-TIME UNSOLVED PROBLEM.

What the Slow Solution Indicates.

Some years ago United States Senator John J. Ingalls remarked in a notable address: "The inequality of fortunes and the obvious injustice of the unequal distribution of wealth among men have been the perplexity of philosophers. It is the unsolved enigma of political economy! Civilization has no paradox so mysterious as the existence of hunger where there is an excess of food—of want in the midst of superfluity. That one man should have possessions beyond the capacity of extravagance to squander, and another, able and willing to work, should perish for want of embers, rags and a crust, renders society unintelligible. It makes the charter of human rights a logogriph. So long as conditions continue, the key to the cipher in which destiny is written is not revealed—the brotherhood of man is a phrase, justice is a formula, and the divine code is illegible."

Senator Ingalls reviewed history and in graphic words indicated that the Hebrew prophets had reserved their choicest maledictions for the extortions and luxuries of the rich; that Moses had prescribed regulations for the remission of debt, the redistribution of lands and the restriction of private fortunes; he set forth the fact that in Rome for centuries the ownership of real estate was limited to 300 acres to each citizen, and the number of cattle and slaves was restricted to the area cultivated. Nevertheless "the laws given by the Almighty through Moses, to the Jews, were inoperative as the codes of Lycurgus and Licinius against the indomitable energies of man and the organic conditions of his being. . . ." "At the time of Caesar 2000 plutocrats practically owned the Roman Empire, and more than 100,000 heads of families were mendicants, supported by donations from the public treasury. The same struggle has continued through the Middle Ages into the nineteenth century. There is no remedy prescrib-

ed today that has not been ineffectually administered to innumerable patients before; no experiment in finance and political economy proposed that has not been repeatedly tried, with no result but individual disaster and national ruin."

Senator Ingalls leads us on down the centuries and shows that after much random groping and after many bloody combats with kings and dynasties, caste, prerogative, privilege, formidably intrenched systems, the ultimate ideal of Government was reached. At last in the United States of America the people are supreme. The picture he first gives us is in the early years of our history: "The poor, the toilers, the laborers, are the rulers. They make the laws, they form the institutions. Louis XIV. said, 'I am the State.' Here the wage-workers, the farmers, the blacksmiths, the fishermen, the artisans say, 'We are the State.' Confiscation and pillage and the enrichment of royal favorites are unknown. Every man whatever may be his nativity, his faculty, education or morality, has an equal chance with every other in the race of life. Legislation, whether good or bad, is enacted by the majority."

Senator Ingalls points out that less than a century ago there was a practical equality in the social conditions in our country; that in the first census period in the United States there was neither a millionaire nor a pauper nor a tramp; that the first John Jacob Astor, in the first decade of the nineteenth century was the first citizen to reach the million dollar goal. George Washington's estate of $650,000 at the time of his death in 1799, was the largest before Astor's a few years later, exceeded it.

Then in a few words Senator Ingalls tells how the years of the nineteenth century made us the richest nation on the face of the earth—established an aristocracy of wealth which though wearing neither garter nor coronet is welcome often in the courts of princes and the palaces of kings. But he finds that our democracy had not proved a panacea for the evils of society. "Poverty is not abolished. Though wealth has accumulated beyond the dreams of avarice, the inequality of distribution is as great as in the time of Job and Solomon and Agis. Not only is the old problem unsolved, but its conditions are complicated and intensified. Vaster political power is consolidated in the hands of the few, and more stupendous fortunes acquired by individuals under a republic than under a monarchy. The great gulf between the rich and the poor yawns wider and wider day by day. The forces of labor and capital, which should be allies, auxiliaries and friends, are arrayed against each other like hostile armies in fortified camps, preparing for siege or battle." Millions of money are annually lost in wages and destruction of perishable property, the deterioration of plants and the decrease of profits by strikes and lockouts which have become the normal condition of the war between employees and employers.

"Utopia is yet an undiscovered country. Ideal perfection in society, like the mirage of the desert, recedes as it is approached. Human nature remains unchanged in every environment."

Senator Ingalls noted in his address what De Toqueville had observed before him, that though the condition of the masses had been bettered with the advance of civilization, yet the discontent increased ever.

"Political instruction has taught them the equality of man, and made them acquainted with the power of the ballot.

False teachers have convinced them that all wealth is created by labor and that every man who has more than he can earn with his two hands by daily wages is a thief, that the capitalist is a foe, and the millionaire a public enemy who should be outlawed and shot at sight."

Then the Senator went on to defend the existing system. Great private fortunes he declared to be inseparable from high civilization.

"Were the wealth of the United States equally distributed among its inhabitants at this time, the sum each would possess would be about $1,000.

"Were this equation to continue, progress obviously would cease. Had this been the prevalent condition from the beginning, we should have remained stagnant. Only as wealth becomes concentrated can nature be subjugated and its forces made subservient to civilization. . . . All the great enterprises that exalt and embrilliant existence and ameliorate the conditions of human life, come from the concentration of money in the hands of the few.

"Even if it were desirable to limit accumulations, society possesses no agency by which it can be done. The mind is indomitable. The differences between men are organic and fundamental. They are established by ordinances of the Supreme Power, and cannot be repealed by act of Congress. In the contest between brains and numbers brains have always won."

In a speech about the same time in the United States Senate, Ingalls said: "We cannot disguise the truth that we are on the verge of an impending revolution. . . . The people are arraying themselves on one side or the other of a portentous contest."

Nevertheless Senator Ingalls indicated no path to safety.

In the same book in which we found these thoughts by Senator Ingalls we found these words by Dr. Lyman Abbott:

"I believe that the system which divides society into two classes, capitalists and laborers, is but a temporary one, and that the industrial unrest of our time is the result of a blind struggle toward a democracy of wealth, in which the tool-users will also be the tool owners, in which labor will hire capital, not capital labor; in which men, not money, will control in industry, as they now control in government. But the doctrine that labor is a commodity, and that capital is to buy in the cheapest market, is not even temporarily sound; it is economically false as it is ethically unjust."

Dr. Abbott did better than Senator Ingalls, but he indicated before the end could be attained nothing but a blind struggle.

The Voice of an Eminent Jurist.

A jurist of world-wide fame, addressing a graduating class of a University, expressed himself as follows a few years ago:

In one hundred years we have become the wealthiest of all the nations. Our resources are gigantic. The statistics of our earnings and accumulations astonish even credulity. Money is abundant, food is plentiful; fabrics and labor are in ample supply; but notwithstanding this fecundity the paradox of civilization remains: the majority of the people struggle for existence; and a fraction subsists in abject and wretched penury.

"That such conditions should exist seems to impeach Supreme Wisdom. To admit that want, misery or ignorance are an inevitable inheritance makes the brotherhood of man sardonic irony, and the code of the moral universe unintelligible.

"The disappointment engendered by these conditions is deepening into distrust of the principles upon which society is founded, and a disposition to change the basis up-

on which it rests.

"This distrust it is your most important mission to allay, and this revolution it is your most important duty to resist.

"While the conditions of the masses of the people have been enormously improved by social progress, the application of science to industry, and the invention of machinery, it cannot be doubted that poverty is more hostile to society, more dangerous to the institutions of self-government and to the personal liberty that has been gained after so many centuries of conflict than ever before.

"The reasons are obvious. The laborer is free; he is a voter; his self-respect is increased; his sensibility has become more acute; his wants have been multiplied more rapidly than the means of gratification; education has elevated him above the condition of menial toil. The daily newspaper has familiarized him with the advantages that wealth gives its possessors. He has been taught that all men have been created equal, and he believes that while rights are equaled, opportunities are not. Modern science has armed him with a formidable weapon, and when hunger comes nothing is so sacred as the necessities of wife and children.

"The social crisis in all civilized countries, and especially in ours, is becoming more formidable. The muttered thunder of sullen discontent grows nearer hour by hour."

The Views of Chauncey M. DePew.

About twelve years ago the Hon. Chauncey M. DePew, LL.D., a man of high standing in the business world, said in an address to the graduating class of the University of Chicago: "That the problems are difficult and the situation acute, we all admit. But it is the province of education to solve problems and remove acute conditions. Our period is the paradox of civilization. Heretofore our course has been a matter of easy interpretation and plain sailing by the navigation books of the past. But we stand five years from the twentieth century, facing conditions which are almost as novel as if a vast convulsion had hurled us through space and we found ourselves sitting beside one of the canals of Mars."

Mr. DePew, in the course of his address, remarked that there were "revolutionary conditions in the political, the financial and the industrial world which threaten the stability of the State, the position of the Church, the foundations of society and the safety of property."

It is evident from Mr. DePew's address that he was for maintaining the **status quo.** He expressed the conviction that every mechanic, every artisan, and laborer ought to be supremely happy—that their conditions in life were so much better than they were a few decades earlier; and yet he noted an ominous discontent. At one point in his address Dr. DePew made the statement: "Masterful men of great courage and foresight have seized upon the American opportunity to accumulate vast fortunes. The masses, who had not been equally fortunate, look up to them and say, 'We have not an equal share in these opportunities.'" But this momentous matter, something threatening the very life of the Republic, he dismissed with the words: "This is not the place, nor have I time to even hint at the solution of these difficulties, or the solving of these problems." He expressed confidence that the genius existed among us to meet them. Among the requirements mentioned were "more college students and more college opportunities." "Every young man who goes out from these foundations into the world goes as a missionary of light and knowledge. He will stand in the community where he will settle, for an intelligent, broad, and patriotic appreciation of the situation in the country and in the neighborhood."

It was his hope and belief that supreme intelligence would "bring order out of the chaos produced by the nineteenth century earthquake of opportunities and problems."

But standing out in a startling manner in this address which was a plea throughout for the **status quo** in industry, was this statement: "There have always been crises in the world. They have been the efforts and inspiration of mankind for something better and higher, and have ultimately culminated in some tremendous movement for liberty. These revolutions have been attended by infinite suffering, the slaughter of millions and the devastation of provinces and kingdoms. The French Revolution broke the bonds of caste. Napoleon was the leader and wonder-worker, though selfishly so, of modern universal suffrage and parliamentary government. The aspiration of all the centuries has been for liberty, and more liberty."

Neither Chauncey M. DePew nor the men of his circle contributed much to the solution of the problem which they saw plainly, and it went on unsolved.

Colonel Ingersoll's Distress and Forecast.

In an article several years ago in the Twentieth Century Magazine, Colonel Robert Ingersoll wrote:

"It is impossible for a man with a good heart to be satisfied with the world as it now is . . . . When we think of the famished, we feel that it is almost heartless to eat. To meet the ragged and shivering makes one almost ashamed to be well-dressed and warm—one feels as though his heart were as cold as their bodies."

"In the days of cannibalism the strong devoured the weak—actually ate their flesh. Despite all laws that man has made, despite all advances in science, the strong, the heartless, still live on the weak, the unfortunate and the foolish.

"Is there to be no change Are the laws of supply and demand," inventions and science, monopoly and competition, capital and legislation, always to be the enemies of those who toil? Will the workers always be ignorant enough and stupid enough to give their earnings for the useless? Will they always build temples and live in dens and huts themselves? Will they forever allow parasites and vampires to live upon their blood? Will honest men stop taking off their hats to successful fraud?" Colonel Ingersoll declared, in that Twentieth Century article as to the workingmen: "All the organized forces of society are against them. Capital has the army and navy, the legislature, the judicial and executive departments." And he asks, "How is it that the rich control the departments of government?" And then he remarks: "There are times when mendicants become revolutionists, when a rag becomes a banner, under which the noblest and the bravest battle for the right."

AN APPORTIONMENT CONVENTION.

In Columbus, Ohio, October 9, a day before the National Council, Congregationalists are to hold an Apportionment Convention beginning at 10 a. m. It is hoped that pastors and Council delegates interested in our benevolences will take this extra day to meet with state officials, officers of our missionary societies, apportionment committees and the National Council Commission for a thorough review of a subject that vitally concerns us all. To secure directness and despatch, discussions will start around definite resolutions carefully prepared to open up the whole subject of Congregational giving. The Apportionment plan has been running ten years or more. It is time it went to the factory for a thorough overhauling. Its percentages,

its adjustments, its methods, its influences need inspection. It wheezes. It could stand some improvements.

The good results of the Apportionment Plan are evident:

It has roused among our churches a sense of responsibility.

It has educated us in systematic benevolence.

It has promoted unity of action.

It has enlarged our consciousness of fellowship.

It has steadied our giving for our Boards.

Certain disadvantages are equally clear. The plan has been too often used in ways that

Have emphasized the mechanical rather than the spiritual;

Have made it a method of bondage rather than of joyous freedom;

Have lulled consciences into contentment with standards low and legal;

Have obscured its educative purpose and power;

Have shut out very largely such essentials as initiative, consecration, vision and enthusiasm.

In short, we have treated the Apportionment Plan too much as a Prussianized method—formal, final, fixed—and have not been careful to open it up to the play of high principle, devotion and sacrificial love. This has produced a feeling that our giving is being determined by rule and that rigidity rather than resiliance characterizes much of it.

These are serious defects. If they cannot be remedied, there is no question about the result; the plan, in spite of its manifest advantages, will have to be put on the scrap-heap. The serious question for the convention to answer is this: Can we frame a plan of Benevolences that will stimulate great and consecrated giving? We have not done that so far. Several essentials have been lacking. We have made little room in it for the operation of the principle of Christian stewardship. The goal has been metallic rather than vital—the reaching of a definite amount of cash rather than a definite growth in the Grace of Giving. The standard also has been low. For ten years the ideal we have held before our churches has been the reaching of two millions of dollars—a sum that will average five cents per member per week. There is no lift or sacrifice in that and our giving corresponds to this lack of inspiration. Five-sixths of our churches do not reach that average. Cut it in two and we still find the majority of our churches below that half-way line of two and a half cents a week. Hardship and inability are not the reasons for this. There are exceedingly few churches which could not reach the minimum of five cents per week per member if they really cared to. In the language of Micah, we are simply "robbing God." The tiny unpaid apportionments, and the extravagant sums spent selfishly both indicate the slight hold that responsibility for the spread of the Kingdom has upon most of us. Plainly, therefore, there can be no permanent relief in a mere mechanical rearrangement of the method of apportionment—no matter how perfect or how desirable—particularly if its basis is the present low standard of giving. In that case the more accurate that mechanical revision is, the more hopelessly it imbeds us in the bog in which we are bound. Our real needs are a new motive, a higher sky, a nobler standard, a plan thrown wide open to great moral incentives. Haven't we been trying to work this thing the wrong end to? What we need is not primarily an Apportionment Plan, but a "Comprehensive Plan of Benevolence," based solidly on the principle of Christian stewardship, using an apportionment system as a primary training course for childlife in giving, and providing strong incentives to rise above it to sacrificial heights. Stewardship is the lesson of the hour in National affairs. Shall the church lag behind the State in spiritual attainments? Let us launch at Columbus a nation-wide movement for Proportionate Giving under a Pilgrim Covenant of Stewardship, planning our apportionment methods so as to fit into and promote this ideal, thus making our whole Plan of Benevolence educative, stimulating, inspirational. Then set our standards high. This is no time for Mr. Littlefaith to be whittling averages of giving, already poor, down to the plane of the weakest exceptions. We might as reasonably attempt to grade our educational standards to the level of the feeble-minded and the four-year-old. When have we given our churches a heroic call such as our land has received and answered in the Liberty Loan and in the Red Cross subscription? Whose fault is it if they have grown narrow of vision, captious and cold? The times are ripe for a great summons. Have we the courage to make it? Have we the ability to stir them to it? Can we make this convention the initial call for the revival foretold by one of the greatest of our Congregational prophets?

"One more revival," said Dr. Bushnell, "only one more is needed, the revival of Christian Stewardship, the consecration of the money power to God. When that revival comes the Kingdom of God will come in a day."

"According to your faith be it unto you."

NOTES AND PERSONALS.

The Rev. A. B. Patten of Forest Grove, Oregon, supplies for Dr. Frank Dyerr at First Church, Tacoma, Sunda, August 12 and 19; and for Dr. Hugh Elmer Brown at Pilgrim Church, Seattle, on August 26.

The Rev. Charles S. Price, who has been pastor since 1915 of the Congregational church at Santa Rosa, has been called to supply Calvary Church, Oakland, during the absence of the Rev. Roy H. Campbell for religious work among the soldiers. Mr. Price begins next Sunday.

There will be no meeting of the ministers in San Francisco next Monday. The meeting was omitted so as to give opportunity for attendance at the opening exercises of the Pacific School of Religion for the year 1917-'18. The exercises will begin at 11 o'clock. The address will be given by the Rev. Albert W. Palmer.

ST. FRANCIS AND THE BIRDS.

Over the ocean, long ago,
In the land of Italy,
Lived a good man named St. Francis,
Francis of Assisi.
Neither silver nor gold had he,
His roof was the sky above,
But he helped the sick and needy,
And told them of God's love,
And all men he called his brothers,
The birds and the flowers, too,
And one day he preached to a flock of birds
A sermon good and true.
They fluttered and twittered about him,
And when he was old, 'tis said,
A choir of larks sang to him
As he lay on his dying bed.
For the birds and the flowers all loved him,
They know their friends, you see;
He was kind to man and bird and beast,
St. Francis of Assisi.

—The Kindergarten Magazine.

For The Children.

OUR FLAG.

Just the second you read those words, what do you see? I know what you see, every single one of you!

Did you ever stop to think how queer it would seem if we didn't have a flag? And did you ever stop to think how queer it would seem if our flag were anything at all but just what it is? Wouldn't you miss it if you couldn't look up every morning when you go to school and see it waving over your schoolhouse? Sometimes when you are working away in school, just stop a second and think about the flag that always waves protectingly over you. If you think loving thoughts to it, I think it will answer you and say:—

"Work away hard at your lessons, while I take good care of you! That's the way you can show now that you and I are friends! I'll need you when you are a man. so wok away for me, and I'll wait patiently and lovingly for you."

And wouldn't you miss it if on Washington's Birthday, and on Lincoln's Birthday, and on Fourth of July, father didn't go up into the attic and get the flag that mother keeps so carefully packed away? And aren't you proud when father lets you help tie it to the halyard and together you pull it out till it hangs down, straight and beautiful from the flagpole? And then isn't it wonderful to look down your street and see all the other flags out? And did you ever think that not just the fathers and little boys in your street, and in your town, but all the fathers and all the little boys in every street, in every town, all over our whole big country from east to west, are putting out the flag—our flag? We all love it.

Hasn't father taken you to parades, and doesn't it make you feel shivery up your back to see the soldiers come marching, marching down the street, lines straight, feet in step, and hear the drums roll and the fifes pipe, "Dixie"? And then, suddenly, boom! boom!—two big bangs on the big bass drum, and the shiny band begins to play—maybe "While We Are Marching Through Georgia"—and you can't take your eyes off the pompous drum-major's tall fur hat with its broad leather strap under his chin, nor off his long betasseled wand which he twirls so carelesscarefully! Haven't you seen it all? But what would it mean without our flag? Can you imagine a parade without it? Of course not! Because our flag is what the parade is all about—that is what soldiers are soldiers for—and that is really what makes the shivers run up your back—our flag!

Have you ever thought how queer it would seem to live under any other flag but our flag? You can't imagine it? Think how happy you will be when, some day as you are traveling in other countries, which of course have other flags, you suddenly see your very own flag! I hope you will salute it like a soldier, when you do! The sight of it will make you feel the very happiest! Longfellow says something about just that in one of his poems:—

ustherre The slender, graceful spars
Poise aloft in the air,
And at the mast head,
White, blue, and red,
A flag unfolds the stripes and stars,
Ah, when the wanderers, lonely, friendless,
In foreign harbors shall behold
That flag unrolled,
'Twill be as a friendly hand
Stretched out from his native land,
Filling his heart with memories sweet and endless."

Maybes, because you have seen our ffag ever since you were born, you think we have always had it, that it "just growed,' 'like Topsy; but it didn't. I'll tell you a little about it. Long ago, when we first began to fight in the great War of the Revolution, we had no flag to fight under. Don't you think it must have been hard for our soldiers to fight the Battle of Bunker Hill without our own Stars and Stripes? They did have some kind of flags, because a little poem written at that time tells us that—

"Columbia's troops are seen in dread array,
And waving streamers in the air display."

That's rather grown-up poetry, but you can see they did have flags, though we don't know how they looked. Some people think that a pine-tree was a favorite emblem for the very first flags; others mention a rattlesnake, coiled, and with head uplifted to strike.

A little while after the Battle of Bunker Hill, because everybody wanted a flag so much, General Washington, with Colonel Ross and Robert Morris went one day to a little house in Philladelphia, where lived Mrs. Elizabeth Ross, who knew how to make flags. They told her they were a commitee of Congress, and that they had come to talk over with her the making of a flag. Mrs. Betsy Ross asked General Washington and the two other gentlemen into her neat little back parlor, and there they all talked the matter over. Mrs. Ross suggested changing the drawing of the six-pointed stars to stars with five points. After it was all talked over and settled, General Washington redrew the design and asked Mrs. Ross if she could make the flag.

She said, "I don't know whether I can, but I'll try."

I think she must have been very proud to try, don't you? And so she made our first flag, and after that I am sure it must have ben easier for our soldiers to fight.

At that time there were thirteen States, and the flag had thirten stripes, red and white, just as you know them now; and in one corner, on a blue background, just as you know it now, were thirteen white stars.

I know you have all looked up into the dark blue heavens at night and seen the stars, haven't you? Has father or mother ever shown you a contsellation? Several separate stars that together make one group is a constellation—the Big Dipper you must all know. In just that way the first thirteen stars in our flag, each star standing for its own State, stood together for one big thing,—the Union, the United States of America! Since then a star has been added for every new State. That is the only change.

How many stars are there there today?

After this, when you see the stars in our flag, will you try to think what they mean, and that they watch over us in the same changeless way as do the stars that come out in their places above us, night after night? We can depend on them both. Nothing can change the real stars, so nothing shall change what our starry flag stands for. What does it stand for? Think hard, and you will know that it stands for all the lives of all the good men who have lived and who do live under it. It is Washington's flag, it is Lincoln's flag, it is your flag, it is my flag, our flag, and we couldn't live without it.

The red, white, and blue! Do you know what the colors stand for? Red is for courage, white is for purity, and blue is for truth. Isn't that a wonderful flag? Its three colors you can see with your eyes, and they stand for three biggest things which you cannot see with your eyes. but can feel in your heart. You can live under its colors; you can live by its colors!

Be proud of your flag, our flag, today and every day, and make our flag proud of you!—Rose Brooks in The Christian Register.

THE PERFECT WOMAN.

If the perfect woman hasn't been found yet, she has been defined, or at least an attempt has been made to define her.

Teachers in girls' schools in England in conference recently in Liverpool attempted to define the perfect woman, and this is given out as the result of their united efforts:

"The perfect woman is forty years old, is married, and is the mother of five children. She is in happy circumstances, living in a beautiful part of the country a few miles from a big town. She is the center of a good home, in which there is a high standard of cleanliness and comfort, and where good taste is everywhere visible, in furniture, carpets, curtains, wall paper, ornaments, clothes.

"The ideal woman is sensible and business like and her home is a place of peace. She is patriotic and interested in politics and does all she can to remove the causes of suffering among the poor. She is a delightful companion, and has a gift for friendship. She is a religious woman, and tries to fulfill her duty toward God and toward other people.

"She takes walks, rides, bicycles, climbs, swims, dances, skates, rows, and plays games. She can ride a horse and drive a motor car. She is proficient in many branches of practical learning. She can do anything and everything about the house. She has some knowledge of the law, knows how to invest money, can use a typewriter. She is a great reader; every day she reads some serious book as well as a newspaper and a novel. She speaks three languages besides her own and reads foreign books. She is fond of gardening and has learned several crafts---wood-carving, metal work, bookbinding, embroidery."

Your Vacation

SHOULD MEAN

REST—HEALTH—PLEASURE

There are hundreds of Mountain and Seaside resorts only a few hours away.

SUGGESTIONS:

Alameda Beaches
Monterey Bay Points
Santa Cruz Mountain Resorts
Shasta Resorts—Sierra Resorts
Yosemite—Lake Tahoe
Lake County Resorts
Klamath Lake Region
Crater Lake—Huntington Lake
Los Angeles and its Beaches

Write for Free Booklet—state region you prefer. We will gladly assist you in arranging a delightful trip. ASK ANY AGENT.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC

Write for folder on the Apache Trail of Arizona

To Reduce the High Cost of Living

Send for our Wholesale to Consumer's Price List of General family supplies.—SMITHS' CASH STORE, 108 Clay St., San Francisco, California, U. S. A.

MILLS COLLEGE

The Woman's College of the Pacific Coast.

Liberal Arts and Sciences.
Domestic Arts and Science.
Campus of 139 acres.

Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, Ph. D.

President

MILLS COLLEGE, Oakland, California.

Kindergarten Normal School

State Accredited List.

Miss Barnard's Kindergarten Normal School is now in its permanent home at

2748 ASHBY AVE., BERKELEY.

Address:
Miss Grace Everett Barnard,
Berkeley, Cal.

Pomona College

JAMES A. BLAISDELL, President.
EDWIN C. NORTON, Dean.

Pomona College is a co-educational institution located in Southern California among the foothills of the Sierra Madre Mountains in the orange-growing belt thirty-five miles from Los Angeles, with direct steam and electric connection with that city. The College offers the degree of Bachelor of Arts and puts at the service of students a peculiarity inspiring environment, the co-operation of a large faculty and the use of ample facilities.

For literature and information address Professor H. E. Robbins, Claremont, Cal.

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

BERKELEY

Seat of the University of California.

Curriculum modern, thorough, practical. Valuable University advantages free. Open to qualified students of any denomination. Location and climate unexcelled. Expenses low.

Address PRESIDENT, C. S. Nash, D.D.